## E DAY BOOK

Vol. 1. No. 87

Chicago, Saturday, Jan. 6, 1912

One Cent

## ROOSEVELT WOULD HAVE PEOPLE CLIP JUDGES' WINGS WITH THE REFERENDUM

Former President Joins in "Anarchistic" Demand of the People That Rule by Judges Cease, and Says This "Anarchy" Was Advocated by Abraham Lincoln.

In a remarkable editorial in the I constitutional. current issue of The Outlook. Theodore Roosevelt demands that the judges be shorn of their power of declaring a law passed by the people unconstitutional.

He declares that no court should have the power to overrule the wishes of the majority

"If the policy of the govern- \* \* ment upon vital questions af- \* \* fecting the whole people is to \* \* be irrevocably fixed by deci-\* \* sions of the supreme court, the \* \* people will have ceased to be \* \* their own rulers, having to \* \* that extent practically resign- \* \* ed their government into the \* \* the hands of that eminent tri- \* \* bunal."-Abraham Lincoln.

of the people, and he points out that for the last 25 years, certain courts have been doing just this thing.

He calls particular attention to that crowning shame of the New York supreme court, the killing of the Workmen's Compensation Act on the ground that it was un-

This same law, which the New York supreme court killed has been upheld by the supreme court of Washington, the supreme court of Kansas, the supreme court of Wisconsin, and is now in force in every civilized country of Europe, in Australia, in New Zealand, in the Transvaal and in the Dominion of Canada.

Roosevelt says he is not championing this, or any other law; he is merely saying that if the majority of the people desire any law, they have a right to have it, and no court should have the power to deny it to them.

He also declares that of all functionaries, the judges are the least qualified to pass on the present day needs of the people

· The judges, he says, can decide well ordinary, every day law suits between man and man, because they have had personal knowledge of such affairs; but he contends that when it comes to questions of trusts, of labor, of the reforms demanded by modern social life, the judges are without